

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
STATESVILLE DIVISION  
5:07cv91**

<b>MELODY ANN GOBLE,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Vs.</b>	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
<b>BUSH INCORPORATED; and BUSH INCORPORATED, doing business as Rooster Bush,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	
	)	

---

**THIS MATTER** is before the court on the joint Consent Protective Order.

Such proposed order was sent to the court via CyberClerk, but is not supported with a motion. As provided in Rule 7(b)(1), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and reflected in Local Rule 7.2, an application to the court for an Order or other relief must be made in the form of a written motion. The court adheres to these rules not simply because they are rules; instead, the requirement of filing a motion insures that the court reaches the issue, inasmuch as there is no provision for CM/ECF to track freestanding proposed Orders. The requirement of a motion further serves the public interest in assuring that Orders which limit public review are based on good and adequate cause. With those concerns in mind, the court will strike the “Consent Protective Order” as improvidently submitted, and instruct the parties to file a joint or consent Motion for Protective Order, therein showing good and adequate cause for the relief sought. Counsel may attach the proposed Consent Protective Order as

attachment to the motion or they may submit it to the court through CyberClerk, or both.

## ORDER

**IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED** that the “Consent Protective Order” is **STRICKEN** as improvidently submitted.

Signed: September 18, 2008

Dennis L. Howell

Dennis L. Howell  
United States Magistrate Judge

